

SN. 09/484,376

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. APTI:027

REMARKS

Claims 1-19 were previously rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Applicant has amended the claims in a manner believed to address the issues raised by the examiner. With respect to claim 4, applicant notes the claim clearly describes one leg as having two transistors. Each of the transistors includes a base coupled to a corresponding photoconductor. When the corresponding photoconductor is activated, the transistor coupled thereto is turned on. In other words, each photoconductor activates the transistor corresponding thereto. Applicant submits the claims fully comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112 and respectfully request the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 1-3 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the single Zucker et al. patent. Applicant submits that Zucker et al. fails to suggest the specific elements set forth in the claims at issue. For example, Zucker et al. fails to suggest the use of an optical triggering circuit at a first location within a substantially benign electronic environment including a cockpit of the aircraft, and a power circuit located at a second location remote from the first location within a substantially harsh electronic environment including a wing structure of the aircraft containing the control surface. Further, Zucker et al. fails to suggest the utilization of an optical cable coupling the optical triggering circuit to the power circuit as claimed. Accordingly, the single reference cannot form the basis for finding the claims prima facie obvious as required under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Claims 4-15 and 19 also stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Zucker et al. and various secondary references. None of the secondary references, however, overcomes the deficiencies of Zucker et al. stated above. Accordingly, the combination of references cannot render the claims obvious.

Applicant notes that claim 17 has not been rejected based on prior art. Accordingly, claim 17 has been rewritten in independent form and is believed to be in condition for allowance.

SN. 09/484,376

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. APTI:027

Conclusion

Applicant submits that claims 1-19 patentably distinguish over the applied references and are in condition for allowance. Should the examiner have any issues concerning this reply or any other outstanding issues remaining in this application, applicant urges the examiner to contact the undersigned to expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

ROSSI, KIMMS &amp; McDOWELL LLP



MARC A. ROSSI  
REG. NO. 31,923

1 SEPTEMBER 2006  
DATE

P.O. Box 826  
ASHBURN, VA 20146-0826  
703-726-6020 (PHONE)  
703-726-6024 (FAX)